



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—THE PARTICIPLE IN LIVY.

We have elsewhere considered some phases of the participle in Livy, and also in Cicero's Epistles¹, and shall here deal with questions not coming within the scope of previous articles. At the outset we disclaim any intention of giving a complete presentation, for this like the subject itself, must have about it something of the indefinite. Combining the force of adjective and of verb the participle is sometimes one and sometimes the other, and the classification as adjective or as participle must often be a matter of individual interpretation. Dynamic verbal force does not appear in the intransitives, and the participles of other verbs also may become static, for there is an abundance of examples in which participial forms express not processes but qualities or characteristics. Some instances of this will be given. In words expressing relationship, such as *nati*, *cognati*, *sponsus*, *sponsa*, *parentes*, *adulescentes*, persons not actions are indicated, though these words may at times retain the participial force, as in Livy 2, 6, 2 *cum liberis adulescentibus*. Other persons also may be designated by apparent verbal forms though indicated as nouns or as adjectives. Some of these get their names from their dress, as *candidati*, *praetextati*, *togati*, *pilleati*, *purpurati*; some from their equipment—*caetrati*, *hastati*, *phalerati*; and some belong to no special class—*advocati*, *coniurati*. In addition to these and similar nouns there is a mass of verbal nouns in *-um* indicating completed activity, as *actum*, *dictum*, *factum*, *inceptum*, *promissum*, *propositum*. But all of these as well as similar forms belong rather to a discussion of the formal side of the question, and are here mentioned merely to call attention to the fact that the original dynamic force of a verbal form may give way to the static.

The extent of the participial usage is partly due to limitations in noun formation. Only a small part of the verbs in

¹ A. J. P. XXIII 295-312; 413-427; XXIV 441-446; XXXIV 172-182.

Latin have corresponding noun formations expressing agency, and many of these are of late origin. While we do not have complete lists of all words used by the Romans we may safely assume that the present participle of the larger part of the verbs was used to indicate the actor. A personal activity is given more frequently than an active personality, *agens* rather than *actor*, and it was not deemed necessary to have a noun formation to express the doer of an action only occasionally performed. This must be borne in mind when we consider the use of the present participle in certain connections.

Orantes, *petentes*, and *spectantes* are freely used, and sometimes where we should expect a noun formation, as in 1, 25, 4 horror ingens spectantes perstringit; 21, 42, 4 non inter eiusdem modo condicionis homines erat, sed etiam inter spectantes volgo. *Petitores* had acquired a special meaning by the time of Livy, and this may be taken as an explanation of the use of *petentes* where it expresses an action immediately subsequent to the main verb, as in 29, 24, 4 quid petentes venissent; 30, 38, 3. But in 42, 46, 9 legatos in Macedoniam miserunt praesidium petentes, a period of time must intervene between the time of the principal verb and the realization of the participial action. The statement has final coloring, but it is the substitutive value which accounts for the use of *petentes*, as also for *orantes*, as in 21, 6, 2 missi auxilium . . . orantes; and 25, 13, 2 legatos ad Hannibalem miserunt orantes. Notice the nominal and participial forms combined, as in 21, 34, 2 oratores . . . veniunt . . . memorantes; and 32, 16, 14 oratores extemplo ad Attalum veniam fidemque eius petentes miserunt. *Oratores* is used several times, as in 38, 27, 8; 44 31, 9; 44 45, 1, but the noun as well as the participle is prospective, and Livy puts into the participle the untimed potency of the noun of agency.

There is a still more noticeable limitation in the formation of nouns indicating the actee, if we be allowed to use the term. Both the English and the Latin have recourse to the perfect participle, and for the form alone we may compare Psalm 127, 2 so he giveth his beloved sleep, with Livy 30, 14, 1 amatam apud aemulum cernens. The use as a noun of the participle in the singular is rare (Riemann, p. 89), and occasionally the participle occurs in connection with a noun of

agency, e. g. 10, 12, 5 *lux insequens victorem victumque ostendit*; 23, 46, 14 *victus aut victor*; 22, 30, 4 *servato ac conservatori*; 10, 19, 2; 40, 10, 1. In the plural the participial noun is much more freely used and *victi* and *victores* are frequently contrasted, as in 9, 32, 9; 10, 12, 5; 21, 40, 6; 23, 46, 14; 25, 31, 15 *victoribus victisque pariter perniciosa fames instabat*. There are also similar contrasts with other words: 39, 15, 9 *stuprati et constupratores*; 26, 48, 10 *non tam advocati quam moderatores studiorum fuerant*.

While the term participle is limited to the designation of some definite verbal forms, there are also adjective formations which deserve a passing notice in the consideration of this indefinite verbal element. Formations in *-bundus* are characteristic of Livy (see Stacey, *Archiv* 10, 64), and at times, associated with the present participle, they heighten the narrative color, as in 21, 36, 1 *ita rectis saxis, ut aegre expeditus miles temptabundus manibusque retinens virgulta ac stirpes circa eminentes demittere sese posset*; 33, 8, 1 *invitum et cunctabundum et dicentem*. As representatives of other adjectives on verbal stems it will be sufficient to give a few instances from Livy: 1, 7, 8 *fatiloquam*; 1, 7, 10 *veridicam*; 1, 15, 6 *absonus*; 1, 18, 3 *dissonus*; 27, 5, 6 *frugifera*; cf. the variation in Lucretius 1, 3 *frugiferens*, the latter expressing activity, while the others give potentiality only.

Some of these formations seem to be doing Helotic service, carrying the burden of expression for the real participles. Of these may be given *aptus*: *aptatus*, *infestus*: *infestatus*, *orbis*: *orbatus*, *sollicitus*: *sollicitatus*, *vagus*: *vagatus*, *viduus*: *viduatus*. However, of these the frequentative *aptare* in the finite forms has crowded out the less assertative *apere*. Some occurrences of *vagus* will do to represent the usage with them all: 5, 44, 5 *vagi per agros palantur*; 10, 20, 5; 21, 61, 2 *vagos palantisque per agros*; 33, 15, 6 *in vagos palatosque per agros*; cf. 31, 21, 4 *palati vagabantur*; and 31, 41, 10 *palati vagarentur*. We also find in other connections 27, 50, 5 *versae . . . vagae*; 44, 42, 8 *vivi . . . et vagi*.

Some adjectives as *fretus*, *inclutus*, *infensus*, *manifestus*, *peritus* seem like adjectivized participles from submerged verbal stocks of which kindred forms are found.

A short consideration of the negative participial-adjective

formations will not be out of place, though not really germane to the subject. There is an occasional negative formation from the present participle, and some 360 are given in Harpers' Dictionary formed from affirmative passive participles. Most of these are negated by *in-*, though by the side of *inopinatus* we find *necopinatus*. The number given in the dictionary represents centuries of development. Cicero felt the need of such forms, and in his letters made a liberal use of negative Greek verbals; see A. J. P. XXI 407. Ovid seems to have added many to the list of negatives, and many appear only in late Latin, where are also found some traces of an attempt to introduce finite forms of negative verbs. Notice the citations for *intolero*, *inviolo*, and particularly for *inhonoro*, and see also the index to Tertullian, Oehler's edition. The dictionary after the citations adds 'hence *inhonoratus*'. But as this word was known to Cicero and Caesar it should lead and 'hence *inhonoro*' should follow. There is nothing striking about Livy's use of these forms, and he seems to have only those which were then well known.

There are many instances of the coordinate use of adjective and participle, as in 41, 10, 9 *favens imperatorum causae et consuli infestus . . . addebat*; and also of adjective and participial noun, e. g. *inermis* and *armatus*, as in 10, 5, 11; 22, 19, 12; 24, 22, 1. A succession of participles or adjectives is sometimes due to the need of presenting different stages of the action as completed or in progress, as in 4, 14, 5-6 *ereptus a circumstantibus fugiensque fidem plebis Romanae implorare, et . . . dicere . . . orare . . . haec eum vociferantem adsecutus* Ahala Servilius obtruncat respersusque cruore [obtruncati], *stipatus caterva patriciorum iuvenum, dictatori renuntiat vocatum ad se Maelium repulso apparitore concitantem multitudinem poenam meritam habere*. This is an isolated passage highly colored, but not more so than many other passages which might be quoted, and all illustrate the demonstration that "the narrative is the proper sphere of the participle".

It is in stories and descriptive passages of Livy in which the participles are the most prominent. Sometimes the account is brief as that of the reception of Perseus by Paulus 45, 7, 5; the details given by Paulus to his soldiers 44, 38, 9; the military maneuvers mentioned 44, 9, 8; or the summary

of the actions of Fabius 8, 33, 23 *haec simul iurgans, quaerens, deum hominumque fidem obtestans et complexus filium plurimis cum lacrimis agebat*. But there are passages of longer length which for Latin are thickset with participles. Of these may be mentioned the account of the destruction of Alba 1, 29; of the repulse of the Gauls in their attack on the Capitol 5, 47; of the Alps as they appeared to the soldiers of Hannibal 21, 32; and of the capture of Philopoemen 39, 49. In telling of the fight at Cannae (22, 47 *seqq.*) Livy brings in more than the usual number of participles, and with them he caps the climax in his description of the battle of Trasumene 22, 5, 4 *ad gemitus vulnerum ictusque corporum aut armorum et mixtos terrentium paventiumque clamores circumferebant ora oculosque. Alii fugientes pugnantium globo inlati haerebant, alios redeuntes in pugnam avertebat fugientium agmen*. For the purpose of showing a contrast in the different parts we refer to 2, 20. Nine sections tell us how with varying success the Romans and the Latins struggled at Lake Regillus, and participles are numerous. Then comes the time for hurried action: *tum ad equites dictator advolat, obtestans ut fesso iam pedite descendant ex equis et pugnam capessant; dicto parvire: desiliunt ex equis, provolant in primis, et pro antesignanis parmas obiciunt. Recepit extemplo animum pedestris acies*.

Contrasted with these are passages in which the participles are not prominent. There is little need for them in enumerating prodigies, as in 35, 9; transcripts from senate journals are equally unadorned (38, 35, 7; 41, 13, 4), and likewise the terms of the treaty with Antiochus 38, 38. The indignation of Gracchus (38, 53) is expressed without participles, and taken as a whole it is in the speeches that the participle is the most poorly represented. If we except the ablative absolute and gerund forms few can be found in many speeches, e. g. 4, 35; 4, 48; 5, 3-4; 6, 40-41; 7, 40; 8, 4; 9, 34. In these there is need of logical analysis, and the impact of the finite verb is needed more than the fluency of the participle. Akin to these are some character analyses by Livy. His portrayal of Cato 39, 40, and of Hannibal 21, 4 are noticeably unparticipial, a result arising out of the necessity of setting forth stable characteristics.

There are a few syntactical points which need mentioning.

The participle may be used as the equivalent of subordinate clauses (Schmalz, Lat. Syn. 180), but with the exception of examples in the ablative absolute the instances in Livy are not numerous, e. g. 23, 5, 13 cui non genito modo in Italia, detestabile sit? 21, 9, 4 apparebat non admissos protinus Carthaginem ituros; 22, 2, 4 iussit sequi Gallos, ut id agminis medium esset, novissimos ire equites, Magonem inde . . . cogere agmen, maxime Gallos . . . cohibentem, though here the participle may be taken as present to *cogere*, rather than as final with *iussit*.

The predicate use of a participle with another participle is rarely found; see Draeger 2, p. 812. A few additional examples may be quoted: 40, 44, 12 propter effusos sumptus factos; 21, 30, 9 militi quidem armato . . . portanti quid invium? 21, 43, 14 pugnabitis cum exercitu tirone, hac ipsa aestate caeso victo circumssesso a Gallis, ignoto adhuc duci suo ignorantique ducem; 3, 5, 10; 5, 41, 9; 22, 51, 9 subtractus Numida mortuo superincubanti Romano.

Of the rhetorical features we shall call attention only to some instances of the etymological figure: 5, 49, 8 servatam patriam . . . servavit; 5, 19, 2; 7, 3, 4; 8, 15, 5 dictatorem dici iussit. dictus . . . magistrum equitum . . . dixit; 9, 19, 9 uno proelio victus Alexander bello victus esset; 27, 34, 13 quid ita male credito . . . crederent? 37, 54, 17 nec terra mutata mutavit genus aut mores; 44, 45, 7 oppidum deditum militibus datur diripiendum.

We have made no effort in any part to determine the ratio of participles to finite verbs. We have rejected those participles and verbal formations with adjective force, though they are practically the equivalents of participles in many instances, and any ratio established with them left out would be unsatisfactory.

Many verbs in Latin were not in stable equilibrium so far as voice was concerned. On this point see Jahnsson, De Verb. Lat. Deponentibus, especially his words, page 78, "usus multorum verborum in sermone populari semper vacillabat", and also cf. p. 75. A considerable number of deponent participles, noticeably *expertus* are used by Livy in the passive voice; see Kühnast, p. 271. The instances of *comitatus* passive may be held to be from *comito*. Some other verbs

also have two forms, e. g. *iuro*: *iuror*, *mereo*: *mereor*. *Iuratus* in 32, 22, 7 *iuratus se eum sua manu interempturum* . . . *pervicit*, is deponent, while in other passages it may be considered passive, as in 26, 3, 5 *iurati permulti dicerent*; 26, 33, 14 *quod senatus iuratus* . . . *censeat*; 30, 40, 11 *patres igitur iurati* . . . *censuerunt*. In like manner *meriti* is active 42, 38, 4 *si male meriti clementiam populi experti essent*, bene merendo liberalitatem experirentur, though it is passive in other passages. In contrast with this voice-shift in the deponents is the use of some passive forms with active or middle force. The ones most commonly used in this way are *fusus*, *vectus*, *versus* with their compounds, e. g. 8, 35, 8 *circumfusi ac gratulantes* . . . *prosecuti sunt*; 7, 40, 15 *versus ad suos inquit*; 2, 59, 9 *invectus in proditorem exercitum*; 22, 31, 1 *circumvectus* . . . *oram*; 4, 19, 6 *Cossus Tiberim cum equitatu transvectus*; 2, 23, 10 *in eos multitudo versa*; 25, 18, 7 *conversus abibat*; 6, 7, 3 *et ante signa obversus in aciem, ordines interequitans*. There is also an occasional instance of similar participles with dependent noun, as in 28, 34, 4; 30, 12, 12; 39, 14, 1 *advolutus genibus*; 27, 37, 12 *longam indutae vestem*. But in this shifting of the voice of the participle there is nothing of special moment, for it seems to have been a common feature of the phraseology of the day as is indicated by such portions of it as are given by the poets. See Schaeffler, *Die sogenannten syn. Graezismen bei den aug. Dichtern*.

The present participle generally indicates an action present to the principal verb, yet as we have shown *petentes* with *venire* is immediately successive, and *orantes* with *mittere* more remotely so, though the proper mental state may have been present from the beginning. In some passages the present expresses an action to which the principal verb gives the abrupt termination, as in 1, 7, 7 *fidem pastorum nequiquam invocans morte occubuit*; 2, 7, 8 *pro re publica dimicans* . . . *mortem occubuisse*; 31, 18, 6; 26, 25, 14 *pro patria pugnantes mortem occubuerunt*. A moment in these may be taken as present to the principal action, but only a part of the participial action is present. In some passages an adverb emphasizes the continuation of the action, as in 4, 25, 9; 6, 21, 2 *iam diu molientes*; 23, 46, 13; 22, 25, 3; 25, 18, 11 *diu cunctantem Crispinum perpulere turmales*; 9, 34, 2 *ille per Cassandrum*

. . . iam diu habitantem . . . caedem fecit; 23, 26, 2 quoad multum ac diu obtestanti quattuor milia peditum . . . missa sunt.

The perfect participle does not always indicate priority of action (see Riemann, p. 307), and at times with some adverbs expresses durative effects: *diu* 7, 8, 5 diu non perlitatum tenuerat dictatorem; 21, 14, 2 turre diu quassata prociderat; 23, 18, 10 saepe ac diu duratum; 30, 11, 1; 31, 25, 11 diu sollicitati ne obsidionis quidem metu fide decessissent; 40, 57, 2; 31, 25, 11 diu optata caede; 34, 41, 9; 36, 7, 13; 39, 29, 10 consules diu retenti . . . profecti sunt; 42, 59, 2; 40, 23, 9; 42, 25, 9 multum ac diu vociferatum reverti postero die iussisse; cf. 42, 11, 6 animum esse inveteratum diutina arte atque usu belli: *semper* 1, 26, 13 s. refectum manet; 8, 34, 2 dictatoris edictum pro numine s. observatum: *saepe* 34, 46, 12 rem s. temptatam. This is not peculiar to participles but is found also with adjectives, as *cupidus* 41, 17, 5; and verbs *trahitur* 44, 32, 3; *caesa est* 44, 42, 4. The duration of being is indicated by *annos* with *natus*, e. g. 28, 43, 11 mihi quattuor et viginti annos nato; 39, 49, 3 septuaginta annos iam natus; 40, 44, 1 quot annos nati quemque magistratum peterent; cf. 24, 4, 5 fidem . . . quinquaginta annos ab se cultam.

Some participial forms have for the most part not been counted as participles, e. g. *adversus*, *apertus*, *diversus*, *editus*, *intentus*, *secretus*, *suspensus*, *tacitus*, *tutus*, the idea of antecedent activity having altogether disappeared, and mere static relationship being left. However, activity is sometimes expressed, as in 22, 56, 1 patres diversi ad sedandos tumultus discessissent; 10, 25, 14 sive iuncti unum premant sive diversi gerant bellum; 28, 7, 1 Philippum et ignes ab Oreo editi monuerant; cf. 5, 18, 8 in editum collem; 6, 33, 5 edita vox. This loss of verbal force may be well illustrated by some of the deponents, as *mortuus* 41, 16, 4 sed inde mortuus Romam adlatus; and *intermortuus* 37, 53, 10 in ipsa contione i. haud multo post expiravit. The plural is used 25, 26, 10 mortui aegros, aegri validos . . . conficerent; and in contrast with *vivi* 5, 39, 4; 22, 55, 3; 34, 7, 3 nec ut vivi solum habeant . . . sed etiam ut cum eo crementur mortui; see Riemann, p. 80. The participle may move still further away from the verbal current, and so far that the absolute of the neuter of the per-

fect participle may become a veritable adverb, the parasite of some other verb. See Riemann, 101; and A. J. P. XXIII 301. The same end practically may be reached through the participle by ellipsis of the noun, as in 6, 26, 8 *pacem in praesentia*, *nec ita multo post civitatem etiam impetraverunt*; 7, 37, 2 *in perpetuum*, *in praesentia*; 8, 7, 22 *imperia non in praesentia modo horrenda*, *sed exempli etiam tristis in posterum essent*; 33, 13, 13 *non in praesentia modo gravia auditu*, *sed mox etiam belli causa . . . fuerunt*.

If frequency of occurrence determines the importance of each participle the relative value is perfect passive 52%, present active 32.7%, perfect deponent 14.2%, future active 1.1%. As would be expected, perfected actions are most freely given 66.2%, and the future is an unimportant factor. While the numerical relations are interesting some individual phases of each participle are worthy of consideration, and differences in case relations are not unimportant.

In dealing with the perfect passive participle the Latin often maintains nominal preeminence where the English makes use of an abstract noun and dependent phrase, 'the sight of the shields of the Romans' translating 25, 39, 10 *scuta Romanorum visa*. Although many participles are used in this way *auditus* occurs most frequently, e. g. 6, 2, 9 *tantum Camillus auditus imperator terroris intulerat*; 23, 17, 8; 25, 10, 4; 25, 38, 17; 31, 10, 4; 35, 11, 12 *fumus primo conspectus, deinde clamor trepidantium in vicis auditus, postremo seniores puerique refugientes tumultum in castris fecerunt*. In the use of the accusative without a preposition there are two features which should be noticed; 1. The subordination of the prior of two successive actions, using participle and finite verb instead of two finite verbs; and 2. The use of the perfect participle with *habere* and kindred verbs.

1. This is a common idiom, and can be illustrated fully enough by 5, 47, 4 *umbone ictum deturbat*; 6, 42, 5 *T. Manlius Gallum . . . caesum torque spoliavit*; 9, 22, 9 *is victorem tractum ex equo magistrum equitum plenus maeroris atque irae trucidavit*. In these the action is exerted upon a previously affected object, and the statement combines both dynamic and static conditions, where the English with two verbs gives only the dynamic.

2. *Habere* with the perfect participle is noticeable, for it keeps the even tenor of its way as the principal verb and does not assume an auxiliary position, as in 7, 38, 9 *cum omnia ea . . . per tribunos comperta haberet*; 21, 13, 6 *urbem vobis, quam ex magna parte dirutam, captam fere totam habet, adimit*. The later usage with *have* makes the Latin usage interesting, though the logical relation of the participle to *habere* does not differ from that of the occurrences which fall under 1.

There are some noticeable differences in the use of the present and the perfect with prepositions taking the accusative (273:576). Most noticeable is the usage with *in* (143:131), but the deduction of 59 occurrences of *in praesentia*, and a few of *in praesens* would greatly reduce the difference. With *adversus* (29:21) present phases of activity are emphasized, while the reverse is true with *per* (19:73) and still more so with *praeter* (2:25) which is used to indicate addition to a definitely realized condition, as in 27, 8, 5 *praeter egregie suppletas duas veteres legiones . . . equitum magnam vim haberet*; 33, 34, 7 *praeter libertatem concessam Achaei Phthiotae dati*. *Per* is usually associated with perfected actions, and the present participles with which it is used are mostly intransitive, most freely *imminentem* or *patentem*. Only two classes need consideration; 1. Those indicating relative position, the phrase being equal to a relative temporal clause; and 2. *Ob* and *propter*, the phrase equalling a causal clause.

1. *Ante*, *post*, *secundum* and *sub* are used with the perfect passive participle to indicate the temporal relation of one action to another, the complex equivalent to temporal clauses with *antequam* or *postquam*. *Post* occurs much oftener than *ante* in such connections (83:15), corresponding somewhat to the freer use of *postquam*.¹ *Ante* (see Fügner, p. 1220) is used with both the perfect and the future in Praef. 6 *ante conditam condendamve urbem*, as is *inter* 21, 21, 8 *inter labores aut iam exhaustos aut mox exhauriendos*. *Ante* and *post* are thrown into contrast in 3, 61, 6 *eandem indolem militibus Romanis post exactos decemviros quae ante creatos fuerit*; and in somewhat the same way in 25, 40, 4 *ante captas Syracusas . . . p. c. S.* In 21, 28, 6 *id ut tutius consilium ante rem foret, ita acta re ad fidem pronius est, actam* should be understood

¹ See Steele, Temporal Sentences in Livy, p. 48. Baltimore, 1910.

with *rem*, thus corresponding to 26, 18, 10 *post rem actam*. *Post* was noticed with *captum* in nine passages, *factum* in eight, and *exactos* in seven. The remaining fifty-nine examples have forty-four different participles, the most noticeable passage being 28, 43, 14–15 *facile est post fusos fugatosque quattuor exercitus Punicos, post tot urbes vi captas aut metu subactas in dicionem, post perdomita omnia usque ad Oceanum, tot regulos, tot saevas gentes, post receptam totam Hispaniam . . . elevare meas res gestas*. Here the principal verb is in the present tense and the participial statement is equivalent to a perfect indicative. The present is also used in 1, 43, 12, and the present participle in 2, 25, 6 *timentes p. Pometiam captam*. There are a few passages in which the principal verb is imperfect indicative or subjunctive, but in nearly all instances it is a perfect or pluperfect. This would seem to indicate that the free use of *post* is partly compensatory for the restrictions placed on the use of the pluperfect indicative. A participle and noun are used parallel with a noun 23, 1, 3 *post famam Cannensis pugnae volgatumque Trebi sermonibus adventum Hannibalis*; 36, 32, 1 *is post fugam . . . Antiochi Amyndrumque . . . pulsum*; 39, 22, 9 *post damnationem et bona vendita*.

Secundum and *sub* indicate an immediate succession of events, and are used much less freely than *post*: 4, 6, 11 *secundum deposita certamina*; 24, 10, 11 *sec. examen visum*; 31, 14, 1 and 41, 10, 7 *sec. vota in Capitolio nuntiata*; 35, 6, 8 *sec. proelium factum*; 28, 24, 15 *sub cuius vulgatam mox famam*; 39, 21, 1 *sub hunc nuntium . . . vulgatum*; and taken either as noun or participle 23, 12, 6 *sec. haec dicta*; 42, 23, 10 *sub haec dicta lacrimantes procubuerunt*; 33, 32, 1 *sub haec gesta*.

2. *Ob* and *propter* are freely used with the perfect participle and noun, the complex being equivalent to a causal clause; A. J. P. XXVII 57. Both prepositions occur with successive participles 2, 19, 10 *ob erepta bona patriamque ademptam*: 3, 22, 1 *lustrum propter Capitolium captum, consulem occisum condi religiosum fuit*; 10, 39, 15; 30, 30, 27. The other participles cover quite a wide range, and from the character of the history refer chiefly to military movements, as 1, 45, 3 *ob rem totiens infeliciter temptatam*; 4, 1, 4 *Vulscos Aequosque ob communitam Verruginem fremere*; 25, 15, 7 *ira*

p. obsides nuper interfectos. However one difference between *ob* and *propter* stands out prominently. The latter is used with *gestas* 33, 25, 1 p. res bello bene gestas, while *ob* occurs with the singular eight times—8, 33, 17; 9, 15, 11; 10, 21, 6; 34, 10, 3; 39, 4, 2; 42, 9, 3; 45, 2, 8; 45, 39, 12; and eighteen times with the plural, as in 9, 42, 1 ob res tam feliciter gestas; 41, 28, 1 ob res prospere gestas in Hispania.

The larger part of all the deponent participles are in the nominative, the different phases of which have been given A. J. P. XXIV 441. As these give perfected actions they are generally equal to clauses expressing antecedence and giving the temporal basis for the principal action. Compared with the number in the nominative there are relatively few occurrences in the other cases.

The perfect passive participle gives the affected, and the present active the efficient element in the narrative, and the usage with the two is strongly contrasted in the genitive, the dative and the ablative without prepositions. Bearing in mind that the whole number of the present participles is only 63% of the number of the perfect the greater serviceability of the present or of the perfect can be seen from the table.

	Perfect Passive.	Present Active.
Genitive sing. with noun....	379	156
Genitive sing. without noun.	1	44
Genitive plu. with noun....	140	128
Genitive plu. without noun..	59	247
Dative	361	721
Ablative with prepositions..	459	137
Ablative without prepositions	191	132

The marked predominance of the perfect in the ablative is due largely to the occurrences with *de* (70:10), *ex* (76:12) and *pro* (44:4), each of these prepositions referring to something that has been definitely realized, and furnishing a fixed rather than a moving basis of reference, as in 3, 18, 1 eadem nocte et Tusculum de arce capta Capitolioque occupato et alio turbatae urbis statu nuntii veniunt; 4, 17, 8 maior itaque ex civibus amissis dolor, quam laetitia fuis hostibus fuit; 4, 9, 1 veniunt pro veterrima societate renovatoque foedere recenti auxilium . . . implorantes. The comparative rarity of the ablative without prepositions is due to the free use of the ablative absolute.

The differences in the genitive and dative indicate the greater adaptation of the present in the expression of personality. The participle takes the place of a relative clause, generally with a definite antecedent, and considering its function in the statement it may be taken as a participial noun or a nominal participle, for there is no grammatical Mason and Dixon's line cutting the participial current. The one doing is readily taken as the doer, and the reference is generally to some one mentioned in the context. However, the statement is sometimes indefinite and this may be illustrated by occurrences both of the genitive and of the dative. The most noticeable examples in the genitive are with *species*, *modo*, *in modum*, and *more*, where the comparison is with a member or members of a class. Some of the occurrences are in the singular, but the larger number are in the plural: 21, 2, 6 ridentis speciem praeberit; 26, 27, 16 praeberit *speciem dolentis*; 35, 34, 9: 10, 35, 4 praebuere speciem tendentium; 22, 17, 5; 28, 34, 11; 40, 5, 4: 5, 22, 6 sequentis modo; 27, 16, 11; and 28, 30, 9 fugientis m.; 29, 34, 10 Masinissa ex composito nunc terrentis nunc timentis m. obequitabat: 5, 22, 3 sed colentium magis quam rapientium m.; 22, 19, 9 fugientium magis e terra quam in pugnam euntium m.: 5, 15, 4 vaticinantis in modum; 6, 14, 11 contionantis in m.: 21, 41, 4 in m. fugientium; 27, 16, 8; 37, 46, 8. The plural is also associated with *more* 30, 16, 4 adulantium; 34, 13, 6 bellantium; 37, 55, 1 petentium; 44, 9, 9 pugnantium; and perhaps 40, 9, 8 comisantium in vicem *more*.

Some occurrences of the dative will also illustrate: 6, 15, 13 vereor ne abstuleritis observantibus etiam oculos; 9, 17, 1 legentibus; 21, 12, 2 si periculum est apud vos vera referentibus; 22, 22, 11 perfugium novas volentibus res; 22, 38, 9 duas faces novantibus res; 4, 53, 7 detractantibus militiam inhibenti. Such datives are comparatively freely used with adjectives, especially *similis* and *opportunus* the comparison being with persons not mentioned in the narrative, as in 5, 28, 4 ferme regenti similis; 6, 13, 3 fluctuanti similis acies erat; 24, 37, 2 op. insidiantibus; 30, 4, 3; 34, 49, 10; 9, 19, 8 facilis partienti . . . facilis iungenti; 9, 16, 18 incommodum ambulantis; 31, 30, 3 praedas . . . agi misera magis quam indigna patienti esse.

We have indicated in the genitive the occurrences with and without nouns, but the latter for the most part belong with some noun not far away. The one occurrence of the gen. sing. of the perfect alone is in 38, 24, 9 iugulati praecisum caput ipsa involutum veste ferens, where *centurionem* precedes and *caput centurionis* follows. 4, 14, 6 may be similar *respersus cruore* [obtruncati], though the genitive is not in V, and is bracketed by Weissenborn-Müller. The forms most freely used are the singular of the passive with nouns and the plural of the active without nouns, and though differently distributed the singular of one form equals the plural of the other.

In the dative there are twice as many examples of the present participle as of the perfect passive, and this is a frequency of more than three to one relative to the entire mass. This is but another indication of the personal character of the dative which frequently gives us the person in action. So free is the usage of Livy that there is no clear line of demarcation between the dative and the ablative absolute, and interpretations often differ; see A. J. P. XXIII 296. While the present is especially prominent in some connections, for the most part the syntactical connections of the two participles are the same. The larger part are associated with verbs, or with complex of noun and verb, as in 2, 8, 7 postem iam tenenti consuli foedum . . . nuntium incutiunt; and 8, 33, 8 tibi fugienti exercitus tui, fugienti senatus iudicium, iudicem fero. Datives which have an additional possessive meaning are used with considerable freedom, and most of these are associated with a word indicating some part of the body, e. g. 2, 49, 7 praetereuntibus Capitolium arcemque et alia templa, quidquid deorum oculis, quidquid animo occurrit, precantur; 26, 7, 3 multa secum . . . volenti subiit animum impetus; and 39, 42, 12 loquenti Gallo caput primum percussisse, deinde fugienti fidemque . . . imploranti latus transfodisse. Of the different classes of the dative only two need special mention. 1. The dative with adjectives, and 2. The dative of reference.

1. *Adjectives*.—The perfect occurs 31 times with 23 different adjectives, while we have noticed 94 occurrences of the present with 44 different adjectives, forms of *obvius* (20) occurring most frequently, while *invius* is found 21, 30, 9 nihil

. . portanti quid invium aut inexsuperabile esse; and *pervius* 26, 39, 14 perviae naves pugnantibus erant. Other adjectives occurring most frequently are *facilis* (6), *difficilis* (4), *similis* (3), *opportunus* (6). With the exception of ten others (26 examples) there are only single occurrences of the remaining twenty-seven.

2. *Reference*.—This construction is apparently Grecian in its origin, and is used now and then by Livy to indicate either the local or the mental point of view: 1, 8, 5 nunc saeptus descendentibus inter duos lucos; 42, 15, 5 ascendentibus macedonia erat; 26, 24, 11 ab Aetolia incipientibus . . . essent; 32, 4, 3 eunti loco alto siti sunt; and similar to these 32, 4, 4 transeunti . . . panditur. In other passages an adjective is used: 26, 26, 2 sita Anticyra est in Locride laeva parte sinum Corinthiacum intranti; 28, 5, 18 petenti ad laevam . . . prima posita est. The mental view is indicated in the following: 7, 10, 6 nequiquam visu specie aestimantibus pares; 37, 58, 8 vere aestimantibus Aetolicum magis . . . quam regium fuit; 10, 30, 4 magna fama vero stanti. The Greek is imitated 21, 50, 10 quibusdam volentibus novas res fuere.

The following table giving the occurrences of the nominative of the future participle shows that in the expression of mere futurity the greatest freedom was in the first Decade in which it is used the least in the expression of real or apparent design.

	Dec I.	III.	IV.	V.	Total.
Futurity.....	19	14	14	3	50
Design.....	5	14	8	8	35
Apparent design with <i>ut</i> , etc. . .	1	4	7	2	14
	25	32	29	13	99

The participles expressing mere futurity are one-half the entire number, *futurus* occurring some half a dozen times. Into most of the occurrences after verbs of motion we read design, though there are a few exceptions, e. g. 6, 22, 9 extemplo in aciem procedunt nihil dilaturi quin periculum summae rerum facerent; 30, 32, 4 procedunt . . . multa ante parta decora aut cumulaturi eo die aut aversuri; and 34, 37, 6 in stationes non ultra quieturi discurrunt. The normal statement for mere futurity can be seen from 26, 38, 8 cum . . . ageret mox de Blattio cogniturus . . . Blattius appellabat; 30, 11, 2 se continebat

regno neutiquam quieturus; and 31, 24, 8 conquiescere agmen iussit vi aperta propalam usus.

The future activity is sometimes conditioned on the performance of some other activity giving the basis for coming operations: 9, 29, 4 quieturus haud dubie, nisi ultro arma Etrusci inferrent; 22, 12, 2; 31, 46, 8; 35, 39 4; 9, 38, 7 Sabinos petituri, si Marcius dimicandi potestatem non faciat. There is in a few instances a similar usage after verbs of motion: 21, 17, 6 missus in Siciliam ita in Africam transmissurus, si ad arcendum . . . alter satis esset; 23, 14, 6; 29, 35, 6 convertit eam deinde, si cepisset, sedem ad cetera exsequenda habiturus; 3, 60, 8 egreditur castris Romanus vallum invasurus, ni copia pugnae fieret. In the expression of ostensible design *ut* and *tamquam* occur oftener than *velut*, though in other connections the latter is the particle most freely used.¹

Distinctions of time are inherent in the different participles, and for this reason time is the most important element involved. Yet this, especially with the present, is often subordinated to personality which may be emphasized with other participles also. But as either element may be emphasized at will no definite limits can be fixed for either. With some prepositions we have a substituted temporal element, and with others a causal, while the frequency of some others with participles is dependent on the expression of progressive or perfected actions. Of the future it may be said that though relatively not important it is used with more freedom by Livy than by Cicero. We do not have the material for other comparisons of participles except for the Epistles, yet all the elements combined—nominatives of deponents, ablatives absolute, and those considered in this paper are as worthy of attention as the strictly nominal or verbal elements of Livy's syntax.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

¹ See Steele, Conditional Statements in Livy, p. 46 seqq.